

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected Claims 17-30 in the Office Action mailed June 18, 2003, for the reasons stated in the prior Office Action. Claim 17 has been amended in this paper. Specifically, the Examiner is maintaining his rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Centers et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,471,486). Applicants traverse the rejection and challenge the application of Centers et al. as prior art.

DECLARATION

It is Applicants' position that the Examiner has inappropriately characterized the Declaration filed by Applicants on April 21, 2003, under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 as ineffective to overcome Centers et al. as a reference. Nonetheless, Applicants do not wish to belabor the point, choosing instead to distinguish its claimed invention from the Centers et al. reference.

Applicants traverse the Examiner's §102 and §103 rejections of the pending claims in light of Centers et al. because it fails to disclose the invention of independent Claim 17, which recites a compressor, a control block mounted on the compressor and storing compressor configuration information, and a system master in communication with the control block and operative to receive the stored compressor configuration information from the control block. Because Centers et al. does not disclose each and every claim element, notably a control block mounted on the compressor, Centers et al.

does not anticipate Applicants' claimed invention. Because the remaining claims depend from Claim 17, they similarly define over the Centers et al. reference.

In the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Examiner fails to cite art, relying instead on what one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have recognized as "pertinent information," which the Examiner includes as compressor serial number, refrigerant code, and oil code. Applicants disagree and believe the Examiner is using the Applicants' own description to construct an argument; such reasoning is prohibited hindsight reconstruction of the obviousness argument. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection, or provide analogous prior art supporting his position.


CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Nov. 18, 2003

By: 
Michael Malinzak
Reg. No. 43,770

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MM:ca